

to denounce the secularists. Against any effort by the Catholics to share in the public liturgy, many Protestants join league with many Jews and humanists to denounce infringement of separation of church and state. This ambivalence works out very well, in practice, for those who are satisfied with the continuance in America of a kind of Protestant culture-religion. It becomes possible to champion at one moment the myth of "Christian America" and at the next moment the myth of an absolute wall of separation. And since, as is well known in some circles, Protestantism and freedom are synonymous terms, the theological problem is settled as quickly as the political.

#### THE THREE AGES OF RELIGION IN AMERICA

In fact, however, the American record of church-state relations has been much more ambiguous, and the achievement of a more consistent pattern of religious liberty in the years ahead will require much more painstaking effort than mere sloganizing or mythmaking.

During the first period, we had state churches in America for over 200 years, and they were no more successful here than in Europe. Time does not allow the narration of illustrations of the long and brutal record of persecution and discrimination, both in New England and in the Anglican colonies.<sup>2</sup> Suffice it to say that—with the exception of a few enlightened spirits such as Sir Henry Vane the Younger, Roger Williams and William Penn—even those who came here seeking freedom for themselves had not yet realized that freedom is indivisible, that my liberty is insecure if another man is deprived. In America, too, the coercive system produced irreligion, so that the liquidation of the establishments exposed widespread indifference to the churches. Just as would happen in the so-called "Christian nations" of Europe today, if they were compelled to depend upon their effective membership rather than upon the watered statistic of the rolls of the territorial churches, the population as a whole was revealed to be unchurched, uncommitted, and unconfirmed.

These Protestant state churches were simply an extension of British Christendom. At the time of the Declaration of Independence, out of 3.6 millions in the 13 revolting colonies only about 20,000 were Catholics and about 6,000 were Jews. The rest were officially Protestant, but in fact heathen. North America was needy missionary territory, and regarded as such by Catholic and Protestant missionary societies in Europe. In part with oversea assistance, and in part by developing home missions, after the colonial state churches collapsed, new methods of mass evangelism were developed by Protestants to win the people back to the churches on a voluntary basis. This has been done, from 7-percent membership in 1800 to nearly 70 percent in 1960—and with 96 percent of adults claiming affiliation, when asked. The real glory of American Protestant history is not that we once had state churches which discriminated against Catholics and Jews and dissenting minorities, but rather that through the great revivals of religion religious liberty and voluntarism have been made workable alternatives to religious coercion and establishment.

At the end of the second period of the religious history of America, the period of the shift of the Protestant churches from state-church ways to voluntary support, the Protestant churches were stronger than ever before in terms of attendance, membership, and freewill offerings. At the same time this was going on in Protestantism, great immigrations of persons of Catholic and Jewish background were occurring. At first

the newer immigrants tended to get caught up in the dominant Protestant culture, except when insulated by the continuance of foreign-language cultures. Both Catholic and Jewish communities, however, developed their own methods for holding their own and for reaching out to the unchurched. Among the Catholics the chief instrument has been the parochial school system, among the Jews an elaborate network of charitable and cultural organizations. Today all three major communities of faith, entering the third period of our religious history, the age of dialog, are of a vigor, membership, financial and intellectual energy almost unparalleled in history.

Never before have three such lively religious communities entered the public forum with each other, equally entitled at law, equally dependent for making their case upon the support and disciplined witness of companies of volunteers. It is this which gives the quality of real excitement to the present encounter. It is this which establishes the case for religious liberty far more surely than any mythical constructs of an imaginary past event. It is this which makes clear that any fruitful discussion of religious liberty in the American tradition must begin with the nature of true religion rather than with the political issue. It is this which gives promise to the future, promise of the flowering of religion which is the expression of joyful and willing hearts (to use the language of the 16th-century martyr to religious liberty, Claus Felbinger) rather than the coerced sanctification of political or even military objectives.

The conclusions to be drawn from this quick review may be listed as follows:

1. All three major religious communities, including the Protestant, are stronger than ever before. If there is a golden age in American religious history it lies not in the past but—potentially at least—directly before us.

2. Even though there are still widespread culture lags, carrying over from the older Protestant hegemony, the real genius of the Protestant churches lies with voluntary initiative and support. During the "great century" the American Protestant church shifted their identity from the style of European Christendom to the style of the younger churches of Asia, Africa, and the islands of the sea.

3. Some say ours is a post-Christian era. This may be true of Europe, where the established churches are in serious decline and but small fractions of the various peoples have effective relationships to any church. In America, however, after the great revivals of religion most church members are new Christians. From a Protestant point of view, the United States is not a post-Christian but, if anything, a pre-Christian situation.

4. Religious liberty is not something which we have had, and are now in danger of losing. Religious liberty is an art which we are slowly learning to practice: it is not a possession of the past, but something to be gone out after. Politically speaking, it is a right which is antecedent to the frame of government itself and to the whole political discussion. Religiously speaking, it rests upon a foundation of faithful voluntary membership and support. We must remember religious liberty, like our other liberties, will not long endure if citizens neglect the disciplined initiative which brought it into existence in the first place.

#### THE CHALLENGE TO PROTESTANTS IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY

In former times it was possible for our courts to say, as they did say, that America was a Protestant nation and Christianity part of the common law of the land. Today this cannot be said, and those who choose to glorify the false image of the first period of

Protestant establishment rather than the work of the second period of emerging voluntarism find it difficult to accept this fact. Nevertheless, the question whether Protestantism will slowly decline to the status of a snarling and defensive minority or perhaps experience a new burst of evangelical faith and witness depends almost entirely upon whether we learn to accept and affirm the plain implications of religious liberty.

The record shows very clearly that, even during the period of the most active home missions and mass evangelism, whenever Protestantism has been threatened in this country it has tended to revert to use of state power to effect its objectives. This was the case during the first wave of Protestant nativism, in the 1840's and 1850's, when anxieties aroused by the newer immigrations produced the virulent anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism of the Order of the Star-Spangled Banner (know-nothing party), the American Protective Association, and other precursors of the contemporary clerics of the radical right. No person was to be allowed to vote until he had been resident in this country 21 years, and no Catholic was ever to be allowed to hold public office. To speak of a more constructive collaboration of church and state, Protestants cooperated closely with the Government and used available tax moneys in the care of the American Indians, as wards to the freed Negroes, in the founding and administration of numerous State universities, and in many other areas involving public policy. The most dramatic illustration of continuing misunderstanding of the nature of sound religion and of sound government was in the campaign which induced 11 State legislatures during the 1920's to pass legislation that only a certain Protestant doctrine of the origins of man could be taught in the public schools.

It should be no matter of wonder, then, that we are still confronted from time to time by misguided Protestant efforts to preserve remnants of the old establishment—particularly in the public schools. The direction in which we should move, if we understand the true genius of our style of religious liberty and voluntarism, is clear; but the right response to court decisions is not helped by slogans such as "a wall of separation"—which are unrelated to our true history, to the actual decisions by which we have been moving painfully in the right direction.

In this crisis of self-image, the first temptation for Protestantism is to defend to the last the slowly disappearing remnants of an earlier dominance. It should become increasingly clear, however, that to maintain a Protestant public liturgy in dramatic moments where participants are of mixed religious commitment is not only doubtful civics but bad religion. As good an illustration as any is the use of Protestant prayers to open football spectacles—say, between Georgia and Alabama. Dean Kelley of the Commission on Religious Liberty of the National Council of Churches has pointed out the issue here, in stressing in a recent manuscript the significance of the "reservation of the holy" to Biblical thinking. The highest symbols of faith are not properly exposed to profane or frivolous view. A more light-hearted critic might suggest that the religious ceremony appropriate to the opening of a football game would be the sacrifice of a rooster. Then, perhaps, the religious officers could inspect the entrails and determine which side is to win—or, at least, whether the day is propitious for the playing of games.

The second temptation, and one related to the first, is to seek a "cheap identity" through a bigoted anti-Catholicism. The appeal of this activity becomes apparent when we refer to the major problem of those churches which have been most successful during the period of mass evangelism. It is

<sup>2</sup>See the writer's "From State Church to Pluralism" (New York, 1962), ch. I.

true that the revival churches—notably the Baptists, Methodists, and Disciples or Christians—have scored tremendous statistical accessions during the last century and a half. But the problematic of the situation in which they now find themselves is given by the fact that in doing so they have virtually eliminated all membership standards. For example: during the generations when the Wesleyan movement maintained its integrity, a clear distinction was made between conversion and entry into church membership. Before being recommended for full membership, a person was required to spend at least 6 months on probation, learning elementary Christian disciplines, studying the teachings of the church, and indicating by consistent effort and devotion that he took his new responsibilities seriously. When he was recommended, accepted, and joined, he promised to maintain the standards of the movement—both those intellectual and those revealed in a certain style of life. In the 1908 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church these requirements were deleted, completing a cheapening process which was already well underway, and today few churches observe even the most elementary standards for preparing new members or developing and maintaining excellence among the older members.

One of the results of this slackening of standard has been that since the turn of the century some 20 smaller groups have split off to form new denominations, in protest against the promiscuity of the larger Methodist bodies. Another, and more serious, is the fact that today there is scarcely an issue on which the denomination is able to present a clear and coherent witness. The new Christians have carried over into the churches many characteristics of their pre-baptismal life, and of these carryovers racism is the most widespread and the most scandalous denial of biblical truth. Verbalization still continues, but without the binding quality by which the Word becomes flesh.

The desperate need of the larger Protestant bodies, including the Methodists, is to introduce such programs of lay training as will develop a people worthy of the name. For a discipline, whether theological or cultic or ethical or moral, once abandoned cannot be restored by fiat. It can only be developed again, in the new forms appropriate to a new age, through study groups, fellowship groups, lay academies and the like. But such programs require determined effort on the part of church leadership, and sometimes agonizing moments of decision between popular approval and right action. Moreover, the affluent society will respond eagerly to promotional drives which expand institutions and call for the giving of money rather than the giving of one's self. As a bishop of my denomination recently put it, in criticizing the work of some of the younger preachers who have been trying to restore a quality of membership understanding and behavior, "The trouble with this emphasis on 'lay training' is that it interferes with the program of the church."

Nevertheless, from time to time even the most nondescript religious body needs a sense of identity. It is precisely at this point that the usefulness of a blind anti-Catholicism becomes evident. This is the cheapest and quickest way for a Protestant body to discover a lost sense of identity, and it has the appeal that it requires none of the effort which the needed program of lay training would involve. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, German theologian and martyr to the July 20 attempt on Hitler's life, warned his people against cheap grace. The spiritual peril to American Protestantism, and the detour around the rocky road of recovery of integrity, is the cheap identity of anti-Catholicism.

#### THE AGE OF DIALOGUE

The imperative quality of the practice of the dialogue is thus given. It is true, of

course, that good citizenship calls for growing cooperation between Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, at the level and with the timeliness of the recent National Conference on Religion and Race. For Protestants, however, the Catholic-Protestant dialogue is the alternative path to the "cheap identity" of anti-Catholicism or the other temptations of the Nativist line. The Christian-Jewish dimension of the dialogue is just as vital for the theological progress of Protestantism. It is not enough any more to speak of our responsibilities in the third period of American religious history, the Age of Dialogue, simply in terms of decent human relations or positive civic enterprise.

For the dialogue is not an end in itself: Truth is the end, and full, free, and informed discussion among those who share a common destiny is simply a means thereto. It may be recalled that in classical Greece there were two contrasting schools of thought and practice whose stance carries over to today. There were the Sophists, for whom there was no ultimate truth. They trained their men to take any case and to "win"; out of their circles emerged the style and activity of the demagogues. On the other ledger of existence was the Platonic Academy, which operated upon the assumption that there was ultimate truth, even though human knowledge of it was partial. They trained their men to share their questions and concerns with each other and with reasonable men. They knew that out of the speaking and listening, which is such a satisfactory way of meeting and solving practical problems as they emerge from day to day, solutions frequently emerge which are much better than any one could have conceived of when he entered the discussion.

But dialog, to be fruitful and avoid foolishness (*amathia*), must be carried on with reference to a responsibility which transcends the immediate issues. Believing Jews know, and Christians know—when they do not betray their baptism and revert to their former status as gentiles—that the ultimate reference is honor and praise to the God of the Bible, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It is precisely this reference which gives the dialog its conclusive promise in this setting of noncoerced religion, where for the first time in history these three great religious communities face each other with potential and promise and with an equality guaranteed by law.

For the dialog to function, however, we must reject the sophistries of the ideologues. In no area is this more needed, accompanied by an imperative consequent return to the common law tradition of pedestrian politics and constitutional evolution, than in the area of church-state relations. Let us reject the false images and slogans of the myth-makers, which can polarize a community (e.g., Hamden, Conn., during the Christmas season, 1961), which can destroy the public consensus, and move forward to solve specific issues as they arise in a spirit of reason and good will. Religious liberty is not secured by defending the continued practice of something called "nonsectarian religion" in public life, by avoidance of all reference to historic religious commitments. Neither is it secured by enthroning the dogmatics of the irreligious. Religious liberty began to emerge in this country with the realization of the profound truth that that service only is pleasing to God which is voluntary and uncoerced. And that political practice is best—whether the issue is religion in the public schools or tax support of religious programs overseas—which begins the discussion with recognition of that fundamental discovery.

Our constitutional fathers did not separate church and state. Neither did they establish a Christian state. What they dared to risk was far more dynamic: the separation of the political covenant from the religious covenants. In other words, they attempted a new thing in history: the proposition that

men could be good fellow citizens even though they were loyal members and supporters of differing religions. They thereby freed true religion from its earlier bondage to political and military purposes, and they freed governments from the intrigue of ecclesiastical conspiracies and cabals. Our responsibility, in the age of dialog, is to work out the next level of a style of religious service and of civic virtue appropriate to the high standard which they raised.

#### Immigration and Nationality Act

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been urging favorable action on proposed legislation—including my bill H.R. 7960—seeking to correct discriminatory provisions in our Immigration and Nationality Act. Because of the widespread interest on this vitally important subject, I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on June 26 before Subcommittee No. 1 on Immigration and Nationality, House Committee on the Judiciary, which reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN HERMAN TOLL AT HEARINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 25, 1964

It is a privilege to present this statement on behalf of my bill, H.R. 7960, and I thank the Chairman and members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to do so.

The experience under the Immigration and Nationality Act, since it was enacted in 1952, has corroborated the views of Presidents Truman and Kennedy and the major religious, labor, nationality, and community organizations, that the policy on which the law is based and the law itself are designed to exclude people and not to facilitate their entry. The law constitutes an obstacle race for new Americans and not an avenue for immigration.

The single major defect of our Immigration Code is retention of the discriminatory national origins quota system as the basis for admission. This formula was first adopted in the isolationist period of the 1920's. The present law is not only exclusionary, but its deportation provisions are harsh beyond reasonable requirements, and inequities in the law as between native-born and naturalized citizens make a farce of the principle of naturalization.

It is because of these and other discriminatory features of the present law that the great 1960 Democratic National Convention included a forthright plank on immigration in the party platform.

That plank does the following:

1. Calls for adjustment of present American immigration, nationality, and refugee policies to eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst.
2. Acknowledges that the national origins quota system of limiting immigration contradicts the founding principles of this Nation and is inconsistent with our belief in the rights of man.
3. Reaffirms adherence of the Democratic Party to the principle that enlightened immigration, naturalization and refugee pol-

ices, and the humane administration of them, are important aspects of American foreign policy.

4. Recognizes that laws to bring greater skills to our land, reunite families, permit the United States to meet its fair share of world programs of rescue and rehabilitation are important factors in the growth of the American economy.

The deficiencies of the present law are also responsible for the historic call made by President Kennedy in his special immigration message to the Congress on July 23, 1963. The President's demand for correction of the unequal and discriminatory provisions of the present immigration law has met with widespread approval by citizens and citizens' groups. On August 8, 1963, 72 organizations affiliated in the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference commended the President for his message, in particular his recommendation to substitute an equitable and nondiscriminatory formula for the iniquitous national origins quota system. Attached to this testimony is the full text of that brief joint statement with a listing of the 72 signatory organizations. It will be seen that they are representative of the religious, labor, nationality and civic groups that make up these great United States.

Within 60 days after he assumed the presidency, following the grievous tragedy suffered by our Nation when President Kennedy was assassinated, President Johnson met with a representative group of some 50 congressional leaders and leaders of private national organizations to indicate his complete support for reform of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, our present Immigration Code.

The committee will also be interested to know that immigration reform, along the lines of President Kennedy's message and my bill H.R. 7960, has the approval of practically all leading organizations and citizens in Philadelphia. On May 13, 1963, 45 organizations cooperated in the Second Annual Greater Philadelphia Conference on American Immigration Policy, Citizenship, and Refugee Matters. The representative nature of this conference is reflected in the list of cooperating agencies which are: AFL-CIO Philadelphia Council; American Committee for Italian Migration, Philadelphia chapter; American Jewish Committee, Philadelphia chapter; American Jewish Congress, Greater Philadelphia region; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers; Association of Philadelphia Settlements; B'nai B'rith of Philadelphia—Men and Women; Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia; Catholic Resettlement Council; Casa Del Carmen; Commission on Human Relations; Division of School Extension, School District of Philadelphia; Episcopal Community Services; Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania; Family Service of Philadelphia; Federation of American Hellenic Societies; Federal Bar Association; Fellowship Commission; Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches; Community Services Department; Health and Welfare Council HIAS and Council Migration Service; International House of Philadelphia, Inc.; International Institute of Philadelphia; Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia; Jewish Employment and Vocational Service; Jewish Family Service; Jewish Labor Committee; League of Women Voters of Philadelphia; Legal Aid Society of Philadelphia; Lithuanian American Society; Lutheran Board of Social Ministry; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Association of Social Workers, Philadelphia chapter; Neighborhood Friends Guild; Netherlands American Association; Philadelphia Citizens Committee on Immigration and Citizenship; Philadelphia Council for International Visitors; Philadelphia Housing

Authority, Social Services; Travelers Aid Society of Philadelphia; United World Federalists; YMCA of Philadelphia; YWCA.

As at the first conference held in March 1962, Gregory Lagakos, Esq., an eminent member of the Philadelphia Bar and then President of International Institute of Philadelphia, was chairman of the conference. The cochairman of the conference committee were Jules Cohen, Executive Director of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia, and Sharon Hatch, executive director, International Institute of Philadelphia. The other committee members were: Tess Corens, HIAS & Council Migration Service; Florence Davies, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania; Herman Gart, Jewish Employment and Vocational Service; Larry Groth, Commission on Human Relations; Helen E. Heydrick, Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches; Melba Hyde, International Institute; Audrey Maetzold, Health and Welfare Council; Beatrice Muller, Jewish Family Service; Richard F. Smith, American Friends Service Committee; Joseph Vanko, Catholic Resettlement Council; Grace Yocum, Travelers Aid.

This significant meeting was not a legislative conference. It was convened for informational and educational purposes. Nevertheless, it is quite clear from the summary of the proceedings that in Philadelphia, as elsewhere, there is widespread support for substantial improvement of American immigration policy and extensive revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, to eliminate unnecessary exclusionary provisions, the unfair national origins quota system and other discriminatory sections.

I introduced H.R. 7960 on August 6, 1963, to help carry out the recommendations made by the late and beloved President Kennedy in his July 23, 1963, message. Those recommendations have my full and unequivocal support. Respectfully, and strongly, I urge this Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality to report out favorably H.R. 7960. Enactment of my measure by the U.S. Congress would, in large measure, redeem the pledge made by the Democratic Party in its 1960 platform plank on immigration. This becomes especially important on the eve of the 1964 Democratic Party Convention. The Democratic Party pledge on immigration reflects my views on the subject of immigration, nationality, and citizenship. It is also clear that enactment of my bill would be in keeping with the announced wishes of the citizens of Philadelphia, as well as the rest of the country.

My bill, H.R. 7960, is identical with H.R. 7700, introduced by the eminent chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. Since Congressman CELLER presented an excellent detailed analysis of his bill in his July 11 testimony, at these hearings, I will avoid repetition and save the time of the committee by omitting my own analysis.

AUGUST 7, 1963.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, the undersigned organizations, wish to endorse strongly the historic step you have taken in your message of July 23 in calling for the elimination of the national origins quota system.

We have long urged the removal of this discriminatory aspect of our American immigration policy.

We are greatly encouraged and wish to express our appreciation for the outstanding leadership you are giving in this major field of human rights.

American Baptist Home Mission Societies.  
American Civil Liberties Union.

American Council for Emigres in the Professions.

American Council for Nationalities Service.

American Committee on Italian Migration.

American Federation of Jews from Central Europe, Inc.

American Federation of Musicians.

American Friends Service Committee.

American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees.

American Jewish Committee.

American Jewish Congress.

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

B'nai B'rith, National Commission on Citizenship, Veterans and Community Affairs.

Brethren Service Commission.

Catholic Committee for Refugees.

Catholic Relief Services, NCWC.

Church World Service, National Council of Churches of Christ.

Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ.

Division of Immigration and Americanization, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

Governor's Commission on Refugees, Boston, Mass.

Greater Miami Section, National Council of Jewish Women.

HIAS and Council Migration Service of Philadelphia.

Immigrants' Service League.

International Institute of Gary, Ind.

International Institute of Greater Bridgeport, Inc.

International Institute of Jersey City.

International Institute of Los Angeles.

International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit.

International Institute of Providence, Inc.

International Institute of San Francisco.

International Institute of Toledo, Inc.

International Rescue Committee.

International Social Service—American Branch.

International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.

International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace, & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW.

Iuliu Manlu American Romanian Relief Society.

Italian Welfare League.

Japanese American Citizens League.

Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia.

Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Pittsburgh.

Jewish Counseling and Service Agency.

Jewish Labor Committee.

Jewish War Veterans in the U.S.A., National Ladies Auxiliary.

Lutheran Immigration Service.

Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief.

Michigan Committee on Immigration.

National Board YWCA.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

National Catholic Welfare Conference, Department on Immigration.

National Community Relations Advisory Council.

National Conference of Catholic Charities.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Council Protestant Episcopal Church, Department of Christian Social Relations.

National Travelers Aid Association.

Nationalities Service Center of Philadelphia.

Naturalization Council of Metropolitan Area, Kansas City, Mo.

New York Association of New Americans.

New York Protestant Episcopal City Mission Society.

New York Section—National Council of Jewish Women.

Order of AHEPA.

Philadelphia Citizens Committee on Immigration and Citizenship.

Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee.

Selfhelp of Emigres From Central Europe.

The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Committee on Resettlement Service.

Tolstoy Foundation.

A3684

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 2

Ukrainian Workmen's Association,  
 Union of American Hebrew Congregations,  
 Social Action Commission,  
 United Friends of Needy and Displaced  
 People of Yugoslavia,  
 United HIAS Service,  
 United States Committee for Refugees,  
 United Steelworkers of America.

### The San Antonio HemisFair for the Americas

SPEECH  
 OF

**HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report on the progress of the HemisFair project which is scheduled to be opened in my hometown of San Antonio, Tex., in 1968.

Last Monday, June 29, 1964, the formal dedication ceremonies for HemisFair executive headquarters were conducted, highlighted by a flag-raising ceremony representing 21 countries participating in the fair. Also, on that day the HemisFair executive committee met with members of the armed services and Assistant Secretary of Defense Nils A. Lennartson for the purpose of coordinating the fair activities with the military and laying the groundwork for further military cooperation and assistance.

The HemisFair is progressing smoothly and according to schedule, and with the continued efforts of those local, State, and Federal officials directly involved, and the full cooperation and support of the San Antonio community, we look forward to the opening of the fair in 1968 marking the tremendous strides toward better pan-American relations, which this fair is designed to foster and encourage.

With the unanimous consent of this House I would like to insert in the Record four newspaper articles from our local newspapers, the San Antonio Light and the San Antonio News and Express, relating some of the details of the events I have outlined.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) News and Express, June 28, 1964]

#### FAIR HEADQUARTERS WILL BE DEDICATED

An address by U.S. Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ and a presentation of flags of 19 Latin American nations will feature dedication ceremonies of HemisFair executive headquarters here at 5 p.m. Sunday.

The headquarters are at 421 South Alamo, site of the historic German-English School.

GONZALEZ will speak on national and international aspects of the HemisFair. Representatives from Latin American nations will present their countries' flags for a flag-raising ceremony. Invited are representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

H. B. Zachry, chairman of the board of HemisFair, will welcome guests. HemisFair President William R. Sinkin will introduce guests. Ewen C. Dingwall, HemisFair executive vice president, will speak on the history of the German-English School.

Following the flag-raising ceremony, a reception is scheduled on the school patio.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, June 28, 1964]

#### CEREMONY TO MARK HEMISFAIR MILESTONE

Dedication ceremonies at 5 p.m. Sunday at the German-English School, 421 South Alamo, will officially mark the site as the HemisFair headquarters.

The Air Force Band of the West will provide music for the ceremonies. H. B. Zachry, HemisFair board chairman, will give the welcoming address, and Rabbi David Jacobson, Temple Beth-El, will give the dedicatory prayer.

William R. Sinkin, HemisFair president, will introduce the guests and speak on the renovation program, while Ewen C. Dingwall, executive vice president, will speak on the history of the school.

Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, honorary cochairman with Mayor McAllister, will speak on the national and international aspects of the HemisFair. Following his talk, representatives of Latin American countries will present their flags.

A reception will be held on the patio following the ceremonies.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, June 28, 1964]

#### HEMISFAIR HUB—200 AT CEREMONIES

About 200 persons attended dedication ceremonies for the HemisFair executive headquarters at 421 South Alamo Sunday.

Representative GONZALEZ, principal speaker, said the 1968 exposition "can be one of the most significant events in the history of this area."

HemisFair Executive Vice President Ewen C. Dingwall noted about 70 buildings will be restored on the fair grounds, in order that the fair "will be a link between the great past of San Antonio and its greater future."

William R. Sinkin, HemisFair president, traced the history of the fair and said GONZALEZ first advanced the idea in 1962. He also pointed out the HemisFair emblem was designed by GONZALEZ' son.

A flag-raising ceremony cited representatives from 21 countries participating in the fair. Consuls from several Latin American countries and military commanders were present for the ceremonies.

Music was furnished by the Lackland Air Force Base Band of the West.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, June 29, 1964]

#### HEMISFAIR PLANS—HELP FROM MILITARY

San Antonio's military commanders were feted at a noon luncheon Monday by the HemisFair Executive Committee at the Menager Hotel.

HemisFair President William R. Sinkin told the 15 officers present that the 1968 fair depends greatly on military cooperation and assistance.

He also quoted a letter from Nils A. Lennartson, Assistant Secretary of Defense, who said, "The Department of Defense appreciates this opportunity to take part in the early planning of HemisFair, and asks that you provide us with information concerning the form of military support required so we can reach a clear and common understanding."

#### FROM SOLO

Sinkin also read a telegram from Senator YARBOROUGH expressing his gratitude and appreciation to the area commanders for their support and assistance to the HemisFair.

Ewen C. Dingwall, executive vice president of HemisFair, told of the forms of military cooperation at the Seattle Century 21 Exposition, and outlined possible forms of cooperation in the San Antonio area.

Among those he discussed was advice and coordination on the proposed military or

aviation museum which will be a part of HemisFair.

#### WILL PLAN

In the near future, assigned project officers from various commands will meet with the HemisFair staff for detailed planning and coordination of coming events.

Attending the luncheon were Maj. Gen. William A. Harris, commanding general of Ft. Sam Houston; Maj. Gen. H. K. Mooney, vice commander, Air Training Command; Maj. Gen. Prescott M. Spicer, commander, Lackland Military Training Center; Maj. Gen. Richard P. Klocko, commander, Air Force Security Service, and Brig. Gen. J. L. Riley, 4th Air Reserve Region, Randolph Air Force Base.

### Court Ruling Is Capricious

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the strength of the country comes from the grassroots level, and I believe it is most accurate to state that the innate political wisdom of America is found there. The recent Supreme Court ruling on State legislative apportionment deliberately defies not only historically strong precedent but, more than that, the obvious views of a vast majority of American citizens.

The Chicago Heights Star, an outstanding publication serving south suburban Cook County, in their Thursday, June 18, edition carried a necessarily strong indictment of the Supreme Court decision:

AS WE SEE IT—COURT RULING IS CAPRICIOUS

A majority of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices tried their hand at legislating for the various States this week and, in our opinion, turned out a shabby job.

The Court majority decreed that States having a bicameral legislature must apportion for both branches on the basis of population. It ruled that this is to be the case, irrespective of what the great majority of residents in the States might prefer.

Although Illinois was not included among the States immediately affected by the decision—our day in court will come later—it is virtually certain that the result will be to invalidate our present State senate districting.

Like a number of other States, Illinois' Legislature is patterned after that of the Federal Government. The lower chamber has representatives elected from districts charted on the basis of population. The senate map is drawn to provide representation for geographic areas throughout the State.

But what is good for the Federal Government, says the Supreme Court majority, is not good for the States. Maps of districts for both legislative bodies must be drawn on the basis of population; an area with relatively sparse population is to have little or no voice in the lawmaking process.

The reason for actually having two chambers rather than a unicameral legislature now becomes somewhat obscure, for there will be no checkrein on populous areas.

The Court majority held that neither a little Federal system nor overwhelming voter approval of such a system, as was given in Illinois, is a valid argument against districting solely according to population.